1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	WESTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA (Asheville)
3	No. 1:20-cv-00066-WGY
4	FILED
5	JANE ROE, Plaintiff, Jan 25 2021
6	U.S. District Court
7	ws. Western District of N.C.
8	
9	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al, Defendants
10	
11	*****
12	
13	For Telephone Hearing Before: Judge William G. Young
14	
15	Status Conference
16	United States District Court
17	District of Massachusetts (Boston) One Courthouse Way
18	Boston, Massachusetts 02210 Monday, May 11, 2020
19	
20	*****
21	REPORTER: RICHARD H. ROMANOW, RPR
22	Official Court Reporter United States District Court
23	One Courthouse Way, Room 5510, Boston, MA 02210 bulldog@richromanow.com
24	
25	

```
1
                      APPEARANCES
 2
 3
    COOPER J. STRICKLAND, ESQ.
       Law Office of Cooper Strickland
       P.O. Box 92
 4
       Lynn, NC 28750
 5
       (828) 817-3703
       Email: Cooper.strickland@gmail.com
 6
       For Plaintiff
 7
8
    GILL PAUL BECK, ESQ.
       U.S. Department of Justice
 9
       1100 L. Street, NW
       Washington, DC 20005
       (202) 514-1280
10
       Email: Rachael.westmoreland@usdoj.gov
11
       For the United States of America
12
13
    SHANNON SUMERELL SPAINHOUR, ESQ.
       Davis, Hartman, Wright, PLLC
14
       28 Schenck Parkway, Suite 200
       Asheville, NC 28715
       (828) 771-0833
15
       Email: Mss@dhwlegal.com
       For the Federal Defender, in his individual capacity
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

(Begins, 2:00 p.m.)

THE CLERK: Now hearing Civil Matter 20-00066, Roe versus the United States of America, et al.

THE COURT: Good afternoon counsel, welcome to this telephone conference. Let me just sketch this out for a moment. This conference is hosted by my Courtroom Deputy Clerk, Jennifer Gaudet. On the line with us is our Official Court Reporter, Rich Romanow, and I'm having the conference taken down. This is akin to holding a conference in the lobby rather than in the public courtroom, but we'll make a record of everything that is said here.

So with that said, let's have counsel identify themselves and who they represent, starting with the plaintiff.

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, good afternoon, your Honor, my name is Cooper Strickland and I represent the plaintiffs.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. BECK: Good afternoon, your Honor, this is

Gill Beck, I am an Assistant United States Attorney and
the Civil Chief in the Western District of North

Carolina, and I, along with Caroline McLean and

Assistant U.S. Attorney Josh Kolsky and Carlotta Wells

represent the 11 defendants other than the Federal 1 Public Defender in his official capacity. 2 THE COURT: And do we have the --Yes, go ahead. 4 5 MS. SPAINHOUR: Yes, your Honor. This is Missy Spainhour, um, I'm also in the Western District of North 6 Carolina and I'm representing the Federal Defender in 8 its individual capacity. THE COURT: Thank you. Well I thank you all. 9 10 Is there anyone else to identify themselves? 11 MR. KOLSKY: Good afternoon, your Honor, this is 12 Joshua Kolsky from the Department of Justice, Mr. Beck 13 mentioned me a moment ago. 14 THE COURT: Fine. 15 MS. WELLS: And, your Honor, good afternoon, Carlotta Wells, also with the Civil Division at the DOJ, 16 17 representing the United States and the federal defendants. 18 THE COURT: All right. Well thank you all. 19 20 Let me sketch out what -- well what I'm doing here and what I intend to do. 21 22 Given the nature of this suit and the various 23 defendants, judicial officers, under the Committee for 24 Intercircuit Assignments the Chief Justice has

designated me a visiting judge in the Western District

25

of North Carolina specifically for the purpose of handling this case, and, um, I now am so authorized and I called you all together to see if we can't get a handle on this case and where we're going.

You should -- throughout our working together and I do look forward to working with you, you should have no hesitancy in calling Ms. Gaudet, she is the Courtroom Deputy Clerk for this case, and we have established our liaison with the Clerk's office in the Western District of North Carolina, and she will get any communications to me so that I can take prompt action if it's necessary. She's the one really to look to as the Clerk with respect to this case.

Now I wanted to get us all together at this early stage to, um, make some comments and see if I can't get my arms around this case in what seems to me an intelligent fashion.

So I turn first to the plaintiff's counsel,

Mr. Strickland. Mr. Strickland, you have a very -- and

I don't mean this critically, but you've got a very

prolix, very detailed, very long complaint, and you've

sued a whole bunch of entities, and, um, that's not a

normative statement, it's simply an observation. And

I'm familiar with such complaints and in this day of

fact pleading I can hardly quarrel with it. But you

filed it under seal. And, um, I will tell you I fully understand the reason why your client desires to proceed under a pseudonym, I have no problem with that, she can proceed as Jane Roe, but I can't leave that -- well if that's going to be the complaint, I can't leave it under seal. You raise far-reaching and profound issues, issues which must be adjudicated on the record. So I've got a proposal for you and here's what I propose going in.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I propose to treat your lengthy complaint really as an affidavit. I'd like an affidavit from your client with her own name saying that she does swear that the things in the complaint are true to the best of her knowledge, information and belief, and where it's on information and belief, she believes them to be true, and that affidavit can be filed under seal and the -we'll call it the initial filing, that will remain under seal, and the affidavit will remain under seal. I'll give you a couple of weeks to file a complaint, which won't be under seal, in which you can make all the claims you're making now, but you can make them in a more conclusory and general fashion, and you can make reference -- and we'll call it the "affidavit," to the sealed affidavit. You can aver things generally, let's say three paragraphs whatever in the sealed affidavit.

Then we'll get the defense to respond to the public complaint publicly and we'll -- we'll go forward with everything on the record. If anything has to be sealed, it's going to have to be in an individual pleading and then an individual part of that individual pleading. But that's downstream.

So for starters, what do you think about that as a way for getting this case going?

MR. STRICKLAND: Thank you, your Honor for the opportunity.

Just to make sure we're all on the same page. ECF Number 1, the complaint, should not be under seal at this time. It is subject to limited redactions and those are identified in a reference list that's under seal, but they're really kind of limited. It's about a page, the reference list. My client doesn't want the complaint sealed. We're kind of in the position now to understand that as long as the pseudonym is granted, um, putting the name on the, um -- it is warranted at this point and will help answer some questions for the defendants and the general public.

You know it --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt. Let me interrupt.

And I'm following what you say. And so we're clear, I have no problem with her proceeding under a pseudonym.

But I'm not redacting anything else. You've got like the name of the defender office redacted. We can't do that.

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, your Honor, and we're there now, that's the notice of withdrawal. We're willing to, um, submit a complaint now that will identify that information.

THE COURT: Well are you --

MR. STRICKLAND: Now as far as --

THE COURT: Wait a minute. I -- in response to my suggestion, you say you'll withdraw the redactions except for her name. Well I'm alright with that. If that's how you want to leave it, that's alright and we'll go from there. But if you'd like the opportunity to file a -- again if this sounds pejorative, I don't mean it pejoratively at all, you must understanding that, but a cleaned-up complaint within a couple of weeks, or within 2 weeks, I'll let you do that.

How do you want to proceed? Do you want to proceed on the complaint you have except she goes forward under a pseudonym?

MR. STRICKLAND: Well I'd have to discuss that with my client, but, um, right now I'm leaning towards, um, we'll fill in the redaction, with the exception of her name, and we'll go forward with a more detailed

complaint. That was part of the whole effort of seeking indictments when the Clerk of Court sealed the entire case. There's no desire here for this to be done in private.

THE COURT: All right. All right. Well that's fine. Then, um, let me take, as a first step, this order and see if you understand it and are agreed with it.

The complaint, save for the complainant's name, shall be unsealed, and the complainant may proceed under the pseudonym "Jane Roe."

Is that satisfactory?

MR. STRICKLAND: Yes, your Honor. The only thing
I want to make clear is that Docket Entry Number 24,
which is the reference list, which was intended for
in-camera review, it would need to remain sealed because
it contains her name.

THE COURT: Document Number 24 may remain sealed.

Okay, so with that taken care of, the -- I know the defense wants some time to respond and I don't think I have any problem with that, but let's use our time effectively here to get a handle on where this case is going generally.

Again we'll stick with the plaintiff, because I want to use our time together this afternoon to work out

a case management plan.

When do you think you're going to be ready for trial here, Mr. Strickland?

MR. STRICKLAND: Um, as soon as possible. As quickly as we can go through this and get the trial date, that's what we would like to do.

THE COURT: Well what does that mean? Does that mean September?

MR. STRICKLAND: That may be a -- that may depend on how cooperative the defendants are in discovery.

THE COURT: Well, you know, we'll listen to the defendants when we get to the defendants, but do you really think you -- I'm specially assigned to this case, my duty is to get this case ready for trial and adjudicate it. Now there may be some weigh stations along the way and my duty is to deal with those as they come up. But this is not a case where, um, we're concerned with a lengthy civil docket or the like, I'm specially assigned, so I've got duties, with all reasonable speed, to address this case.

So I'm asking you, how about December?

MR. STRICKLAND: I think it's -- I think it's entirely possible. Again, you know from where I'm sitting right now, to -- well September hopefully, but December, absolutely. There really is no desire on the

part of the plaintiff here to have this linger. It's had enough of a negative effect as it is.

THE COURT: Well no one suggests she wants it to linger. All right, let's turn to the defense.

When do you think the case, in its -- again I'm not judging the case in any way, but in its limited -- if I take a limited view of this case, the interactions that happened in that particular defender office, this is not that complex a case and it's a case similar to other cases with which I've had experience. The complaint goes far beyond that into the mechanisms of the court, the circuit, the judicial conference of the United States. Those present more profound issues, but those probably are issues of law. So -- as I have been saying, it's my duty to confront these matters, though this is our initial sitdown together.

What does the defense say about a reasonable trial date? I work everything back from the trial date.

MR. BECK: Your Honor, this is Gill Beck, the Civil Chief in the Western District. Obviously we're coordinating with the Federal Programs branch and DOJ and you're moving very fast for us and, um, we appreciate that from the defense's perspective because we want to see the case dismissed.

So to answer your question, December, I would say

yes, but before that we want the opportunity to present dispositive motions to the Court because we feel very strongly on behalf of the defendants that the legal issues, as you've pointed out, the issues of law, are ones that the Court can address and that it would be in the interest of all to address those at the earliest opportunity.

THE COURT: Well, Mr. Beck, of course you feel very strongly, lawyers always feel very strongly, but I'm not doing you out of our motion to dismiss and if you lose that, I'm not doing you out of your motion for summary judgment, we'll do those things. But wrap your mind around the fact that, um, if not your client, somebody's client here remains standing when all those motions are done and we're going to need a jury. So I work back because all the interim dates I can move around.

But when do you want a trial, does December make sense?

MR. BECK: Your Honor, this is Gill Beck again from the U.S. Attorney's Office. I would say yes, but I would like the opportunity for Federal Programs to weigh in because we have not specifically talked about a trial date.

THE COURT: Well I always talk about trial dates

early on. When you say "Federal Programs," I'm not so sure exactly what you mean. Who speaks for Federal Programs?

MR. KOLSKY: That would be --

MR. BECK: Yes, Josh, please go ahead.

MR. KOLSKY: Your Honor, this is Josh Kolsky from the Federal Programs branch. I am actually going to be -- I expect to be out on paternity leave in December, so I think January would be better from my perspective.

THE COURT: Well January is fine. I'm placing it -- so let's say I'm placing it on my running trial list for January, 2020.

Now my practice is not to continue that date, people come to court to have a trial, and, um, my job, where there are triable cases, is to provide that trial. So let's work back from there.

If the trial is going to be sometime in January, then by the 1st of December, um -- I misspoke, January 2021 is the trial. A final pretrial memorandum on December 1, 2020. I would expect that the latest date for dispositive motions would be the 1st of October, and I say that because I treat those with great care, assign law clerks, give them an oral hearing, and you don't want to crowd them right up to the trial because then you've wasted your money. So dispositive motions must

be filed no later than October 1, 2020. I'll give you -- and that's really that all I need to set down now.

I -- the defense wants some time to respond. I have no objection to that, but you're all going to find that a January 2021 trial date is -- will come upon us pretty rapidly.

So when does the defense want -- what time do you want to respond?

MR. BECK: Your Honor, in our motion for extension of time, we, the defendants jointly put the 8th of June. Now as I understand it, the plaintiff will be filing a complaint that is not redacted and we would like 30 days from the filing of that document. You mentioned two weeks and maybe another date, but we would like 30 days to answer our complaint or otherwise move to dismiss. We plan to move to dismiss from the filing of the complaint you described earlier in the conversation, the unredacted complaint, except for the plaintiff proceeding with a pseudonym.

THE COURT: Well wait a minute. The plaintiff doesn't have to file anything else, he's just withdrawing his, um, chance or his effort to redact things other than the pseudonym. You know what the complaint is, you've known it for days now. So it seems

to me June 8th makes perfect sense. And you're to respond, however you do respond, by the 8th of June.

MR. STRICKLAND: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: And what you do have is, all of you, you've got two weeks from today's date to sit down and work out a joint proposed case management schedule.

Now wrap your minds around the possibility that the motion to dismiss is denied either in whole or in part, just theoretically. It may not be, but theoretically it could be. So I want you to work out what it is that you want to discover and from whom you want discovery and all those things.

Now I do not require that you agree to this, but within two weeks time I want a joint, that means all of you, plaintiffs and all the defense counsel, proposal, and where you disagree I want the plaintiff to set forth, um, her position and I want the defense to set forth their position. And I want you all to be reasonable. And you can disagree about any point, you can disagree about how many depositions, about what discovery, about where discovery takes place. I urge you to agree. But you may disagree. I'm not forcing it.

And then I learned this from the great judge,
Robert Keeton, and I'm going to take that and like a

baseball arbitrator, I'm going to pick the most reasonable proposal. I'm not going to middle it or impose my own views, I'm just going to read it all over and pick which proposal is most reasonable. So if one of you wants 50 depositions and one of you wants 3 and that's all that we're -- that's the only choice I have, it's either going to be 50 or 3. So what you want to do is truly be reasonable. It's been my experience that if you ask lawyers to be reasonable and you give them an incentive to be reasonable, they are. And that satisfies the rules of civil procedure now as to proportionality, because you people are the masters of your own case and you know what's proportional in the circumstances.

A word about this handling of the case remotely.

It's remotely now because of the pandemic, but God willing -- and the pandemic has hit hard in Massachusetts, so I am on this conference, for instance, from a remote location, and some of you may be in your offices. God willing in the months ahead, I will be back in court. But wherever I am, when I am specially assigned as a visiting judge, I make a true effort not to make the proceeding more costly than proceeding in federal court or in any event.

So wherever you would get an oral hearing, I will

give you an oral hearing. It will either be by video conference -- if we're not in the courtroom, we'll do it by zoom, and if I am in the courtroom, I can do it by video conference, and you can go to your local courthouse and that's where we'll confer.

Those things that I handle on the papers, I will normally handle on the papers. Discovery motions are an example. I handle -- I don't refer things to a magistrate, I have great respect for them, but I like to use them for trials. So I'll handle all the discovery, all aspects of the case, and I'll handle them on the papers.

Let's see. I think I've done everything I need to do, but let me go around and see if there are any questions, because I'd like to get your questions both about the procedure and then about the substance of this case, if I've left any questions unanswered. And again we'll start with Mr. Strickland for the plaintiff.

MR. STRICKLAND: I think one of the remaining questions I have is with respect to the John Doe defendants and whether they're actually going to be parties to this case or not, because I think that's going to affect the timeline in the near term.

THE COURT: Well why don't you be more specific, to whom are you referring?

1 MR. STRICKLAND: We filed a motion for early discovery, but that's not necessarily needed, the Court 2 could just order that the defendants accept service. THE COURT: Well who are they? 4 5 MR. STRICKLAND: They're the individuals described in the complaint. For example, in our motion for early 6 discovery there's an Exhibit A, which was an e-mail 8 between the defendant Ishida and its receiver and it's quoting advice from the Office of General Council with 9 10 respect to this proceeding. 11 THE COURT: And so you're suing someone in the 12 Office of General Council? MR. STRICKLAND: Yeah, just like Sheryl Walter, 13 who's the General Counsel herself, she was a defendant, 14 15 she accepted service. But I believe the position of defendants' counsel is they don't know who the John Doe 16 17 defendants are. THE COURT: Well I'll tell you what. Look, if 18 19 that's a deposition, that's a matter to be worked out in 20 your joint proposed case management schedule. You work 21 that out. I think counsel would be able to work that 22 out. 23 Any other questions? 24 (Silence.) 25 THE COURT: I hear none.

How about the defense, any questions how we're going to proceed?

MR. BECK: Your Honor, this is Gill Beck from the U.S. Attorney's Office. In the, um -- in the Western District under our local rules, which I assume we'll be proceeding under, the district judge who handles that, um, can always have standing orders. If, for example, on the page limit for briefs, the Western District rule is 25 pages, and I looked at the Massachusetts website and Massachusetts Rule 7.1 says 20 pages, which it appears is that's what you followed. Would we be following the Western District rule of 25 pages on a motion?

THE COURT: Well since I'm the visiting judge -- and that's a good question, and the answer is "Yes."

MR. BECK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Your local rules obtain unless I find it hard to get my mind around it. In -- I'm a visiting judge in Puerto Rico too, not that you're interested in this story, but in Puerto Rico, if you decide to strike a brief because it's overly long, then the other side immediately takes the position that the other side hasn't opposed the motion and they move that the motion be allowed if it's unopposed, and that has created some confusion on my part. But so long as I can understand

your local rules, you should conform to your local rules and I will accept them. That's a very good question.

THE COURT: Other questions? Yes.

MR. BECK: Yes, your Honor, this is Gill Beck again from the U.S. Attorney's Office. So under our local practice, say for example a motion for extension of time, we do not submit a proposed order, the Court enters a text order on routine things such as a motion for an extension of time. Do you want us to submit proposed orders?

THE COURT: No. My practice is to enter what I call "margin orders" or "minute orders." You make a motion, I'll act on it.

Good questions. How about any of the rest of you, any questions?

MR. KOLSKY: Nothing from me, your Honor, and this is Joshua Kolsky.

THE COURT: Sure.

Well hearing you, I really do look forward to working with all of you and, um, don't hesitate to call Ms. Gaudet.

And one other thing. Should this case settle, and I devoutly hope that it does, um, a settlement -- if you communicate with Ms. Gaudet that the case is settled, then don't spend any more money, we'll put the case on

ice, you can decide when and what you want to put on the public record, if anything. But don't ever make the call because she knows what to do and we will close the case down. And then if it becomes unwound, you'll find me a very sticky wicket indeed, it will be very hard to get back on the trial list then.

So with that, if there are no other questions, I do thank you for your time this afternoon, I look forward to working with you, and we'll wait for the filing of the joint proposed case management schedule and the other motions, answers, will come in due course. I thank you very much. We'll stand in recess.

(Ends, 2:30 p.m.)

```
CERTIFICATE
1
 2
 3
            I, RICHARD H. ROMANOW, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER,
 4
     do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true
 5
     and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes
 6
     before Judge William G. Young, on Monday, May 11, 2020,
7
     to the best of my skill and ability.
8
9
10
11
     /s/ Richard H. Romanow 01-22-21
     RICHARD H. ROMANOW Date
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```